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# Planning Services Committee Meeting Minutes
**Monday 16 July 2012 - Council Boardroom**

## 1. Declaration of Opening

Due to the absence of the Chairman, Cr Richard Smith, the Director Planning and Development Services declared the Planning Services Committee Meeting open at 4.00pm and welcomed all present.

## 2. Election of Presiding Member/Chairperson

The Director Planning and Development Services, Mr Bob Jeans, invited nominations for the position of Chairperson of the Planning Services Committee.

The following nomination was received:-

Cr Liley

As there was no more than one nomination for the position, Cr Liley was declared elected to the position of Chair of the Planning Services Committee.

Cr Liley assumed the Chair and welcomed all present.

## 3. Record of Attendance/Apologies/Approved Leave of Absence

### 2.1 Councillors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cr Leigh Liley</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deb Hamblin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr Allan Hill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr Lorraine Dunkling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.2 Executive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Bob Jeans</td>
<td>Director Planning and Development Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Peter Ricci</td>
<td>Project Manager Keralup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Brett Ashby</td>
<td>Manager Strategic Planning and Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Richard Rodgers</td>
<td>Manager Building Services (until 4.16pm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Mike Ross</td>
<td>Manager Statutory Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Erica Scott</td>
<td>Coordinator Health Services (until 4.16pm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Melinda Wellburn</td>
<td>PA to Director Planning and Development Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Members of the Public:**

- 8

**Press:**

- 1

### 2.3 Apologies:

- Cr Richard Smith
- Cr Chris Elliott
- Mr Andrew Hammond
- Chief Executive Officer

### 2.4 Approved Leave of Absence:

- Nil
4. Responses to Previous Public Questions Taken on Notice

Nil

5. Public Question Time

Ms Margaret Browne, No.50A Smythe Street, Rockingham - SP-045/12
Ms Browne asked why it was necessary to change the plot ratio of the property to allow an additional three dwellings to be developed.
Mr Jeans advised that the increase in plot ratio was dealt with through the assessment of the application and this information was contained within the report and that the matter would be discussed later on the Agenda.

Mr Jean Goder, No.92 Cleopatra Street, Palmyra - SP-045/12
Mr Goder stated that he owned five properties in the area and that he supported the proposal.

6. Confirmation of Minutes of the Previous Planning Services Committee Meeting

Moved Cr Hill, seconded Cr Liley:

That Council CONFIRM the Minutes of the Planning Services Committee Meeting held on 18 June 2012, as a true and accurate record.

Committee Voting – 4/0

7. Matters Arising from the Previous Planning Services Committee Meeting Minutes

Nil

8. Announcement by the Presiding Person without Discussion

The Chairperson announced to all present that decisions made at Committees of Council are recommendations only and may be adopted in full, amended or deferred when presented for consideration at the next Council meeting.

9. Declarations of Members and Officers Interests

9.1 Item SP-044/12 Proposed Extension of Hours to Approved Home Occupation (Dog Grooming)
Councillor/Officer: Cr D Hamblin
Type of Interest: Proximity Interest
Nature of Interest: Owns property at 8B Bass Court, Waikiki
Extent of Interest (if applicable): N/A

10. Petitions/Deputations/Presentations/Submissions


11. Matters for which the Meeting may be Closed

Nil
### Bulletin Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Services Information Bulletin – July 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health Services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Health Services Team Overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Human Resource Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Project Status Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Foodsafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Industrial and Commercial Waste Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Community Health &amp; Wellbeing Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Healthy Communities Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Health Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 North Rockingham Industrial Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7 Ocean Water Sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Information Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Mosquito-Borne Disease Notifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Food Recalls - June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Food Premises Inspections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Public Building Inspections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Outdoor Public Event Approvals - June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 After Hours Noise &amp; Smoke Nuisance Complaint Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Complaint - Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 Building Plan Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9 Septic Tank Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10 Demolitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11 Swimming Pool And Drinking Water Samples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.12 Rabbit Processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.13 Hairdressing &amp; Skin Penetration Premises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.14 Family Day Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Building Services Team Overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Human Resource Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Project Status Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Information Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Legislation Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Private Swimming Pool and Spa Inspection Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Monthly Building Licence Approvals - (All Building Types)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Occupancy Permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Street Verandah Licence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Permanent Sign Licence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Building Approval Certificates for Unauthorised Building Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 Occupancy Permit- Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9 Monthly Caravan Park Site Approvals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Planning and Environment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Strategic Planning and Environment Team Overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Human Resource Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Project Status Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Policy Manual Review (LUP/1265)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 Local Planning Strategy (LUP/1352)
3.3 Amendment No.114 - Developer Contribution Plan No.2 (LUP/909)
3.4 Local Biodiversity Strategy Review (EVM/22)
3.5 Karnup District Water Management Strategy (EVM/136)
3.6 Lake Richmond Water Quality Studies and Integrated Catchment Management Plan (EVM/135)
3.7 Water Campaign (EVM/56-02)

4. Information Items
4.1 Delegated Final Adoption of Structure Plan
4.2 Delegated Minor Change to Structure Plan
4.3 Future Operation of the Point Peron Wastewater Treatment Plant (LUP/1426)
4.4 Proposed Lifting of Urban Deferment – Portion of Lots Bounded by Pike, Eighty and Mandurah Roads, Baldivis (LUP/109)
4.5 Economic and Employment Lands Strategy: Non-Heavy Industrial for Perth Metropolitan and Peel Regions 2012 (LUP/1414)
4.6 Development Control Policy 1.8 - Canal Estates and Artificial Waterway Developments
4.7 Karnup District Structure Plan

Statutory Planning
1. Statutory Planning Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
   3.1 CouncilsOnline (Planning Products via the Web) formerly eDA
4. Information Items
   4.1 Land Use – Planning Enforcement
   4.2 Subdivision/Development Approvals and Refusals by the WAPC
   4.3 Notifications and Gazettals
   4.4 Subdivision Clearances
   4.5 Subdivision Survey Approvals
   4.6 Delegated Development Approvals
   4.7 Delegated Development Refusals
   4.8 Delegated Building Envelope Variations
   4.9 Subdivision/Amalgamation Approved
   4.10 Subdivision/Amalgamation Refused
   4.11 Development Assessment Panels – Development Applications
   4.12 Final Approval of Amendment 99 to Town Planning Scheme No.2 - Additional Use for Communications Antenna - Lot 48 (No.335) Eighty Road, Baldivis

Director Planning and Development Services
1. Director Planning and Development Services Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
   3.1 Administration Building Refurbishment/Fitout
   3.2 Rockingham Primary Centre Infrastructure - Business Case
   3.3 Smart Village 1 Masterplan
   3.4 Keralup
   3.5 Karnup Station Transit Oriented Development
4. Information Items
   4.1 Metropolitan Region Scheme Amendment - Strategic Regional Centre - Review of Air Quality Buffer – Activity Centre North (Area 3; Sector 5)
Committee Recommendation

That Councillors acknowledge having read the Planning Services Information Bulletin – July 2012 and the contents be accepted.

Committee Voting – 4/0

4.16pm - Mr Richard Rodgers, Manager Building Services and Ms Erica Scott, Coordinator Health Services left the Planning Services Committee meeting.
12. **Agenda Items**

**Strategic Planning and Environment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>SPE-015/12 Baldivis District Town Centre Activity Centre Structure Plan - Adoption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>LUP/862-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>Urbis (on behalf of Stockland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Mr Ross Underwood, Senior Planning Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td>Mr Jeff Bradbury, Coordinator Strategic Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Brett Ashby, Manager Strategic Planning and Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>16th July 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td>April 2012 (SPE-006/12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td>Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</td>
<td>Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>Various sites in Baldivis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area:</td>
<td>72.55ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Zoning:</td>
<td>District Town Centre (north of Safety Bay Road) and Development (south of Safety Bay Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS Zoning:</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td>1. Draft Baldivis Activity Centre Structure Plan (as advertised)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Schedule of Submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps/Diagrams:</td>
<td>1. Location Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Adopted IDGP (May 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Proposed IDGP (November 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Planning Framework of the BACSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Precinct Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Proposed Baldivis Activity Centre Structure Plan Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Safety Bay Road Intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Bus Routes and Bus Stops Identified in the BACSP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Purpose of Report**

To consider for adoption a proposed Activity Centre Structure Plan for the Baldivis Activity Centre (the Centre), incorporating the area shown on Figure 1.

![](image1.png)

**Figure 1 - Location Plan**

2. **Background**

In June 1999, the Council adopted an Integrated Development Guide Plan (IDGP) and a Planning Policy for the Baldivis Town Centre (BTC Policy) to guide the future development of the Baldivis Town Centre, being the land north of Safety Bay Road. An amendment to Town Planning Scheme No.1 was gazetted in February 2000 which rezoned the land to ‘Baldivis Town Centre’.

The IDGP has been modified several times since 1999; most recently in May 2011 (see Figure 2). A major update to the BTC Policy was adopted by the Council in February 2009. In March 2012, the ‘Baldivis Town Centre’ zone was renamed the ‘District Town Centre’ zone.
In November 2011, the Council resolved to advertise an application to amend the IDGP, subject to a number of matters being addressed prior to the proposal being advertised. The application proposed to alter the street network over Lot 9001, being the northwest quarter of the Baldivis Town Centre, and facilitate the development of 2,500m² of shop/retail floorspace on Lot 9001 along an extended Settlers Avenue (See Figure 3). The proposal is yet to be advertised for comment as the matters identified by the Council as requiring addressing prior to advertising have not yet been satisfied.
3. **Details**

In April 2012, the Council considered a proposed Activity Centre Structure Plan for the Baldivis Activity Centre (BACSP), to facilitate the expansion of the shop/retail floorspace of the Centre beyond the 25,000m² maximum allocated to the Centre in the City's Planning Policy 6.3 – *Local Commercial Strategy* (LCS).

The BACSP is intended as a strategic planning document, prepared in accordance with State Planning Policy 4.2 – *Activity Centres for Perth and Peel* (SPP4.2), that provides a strategic framework for the Centre and informs and guides modifications to the statutory planning framework including TPS2, the IDGP, the BTC Policy and the Settlers Hills East Structure Plan. The following chart outlines the relationship between the BACSP and the planning framework:-
The BACSP includes the following vision for the Centre:

“In 2031, the Baldivis Activity Centre will have a mixture of housing, office, shops, dining, community, entertainment and recreational uses that together create a harmonious and vibrant centre that is a community focal point for social interaction and effectively services the urban needs of the Baldivis locality.”

The proposed boundary of the Centre extends beyond the existing boundaries of the District Town Centre zone to incorporate part of the Settlers Hills East Structure Plan area, south of Safety Bay Road. The extension to the Centre boundary incorporates land that functions as part of the activity centre and is within the walkable catchment of the core of the Centre.

The Centre is proposed to be divided into five precincts, to acknowledge their differing nature of intensity and land use. These precincts largely reflect the existing precincts that are identified on the IDGP. These precincts are identified in Figure 5, and are described as follows:-

- **Core Precinct** – Comprises the major shopping and community facilities.
- **Transition Precinct** – Provides for a mix of land uses, including small-scale retail in mixed-use configurations, commercial, and residential dwellings in an urban setting.
- **Northern Precinct** – Predominately residential in character; intended to link the urban housing form within the Transitional Precinct and retail/commercial core to the more traditional suburban housing product within the adjacent residential developments to the north.
- Eastern Precinct – Strategically located to provide for businesses that, due to their size or nature, are more car-orientated.
- Southern Precinct – Residential in nature; provides a range of living choices.

The BACSP also considers the Centre’s context, the movement network, activity, built form and resource conservation against relevant requirements. The BACSP includes an implementation section, which proposes the following:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Changes Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IDGP</td>
<td>Update precinct boundaries, precinct names, street layouts and building envelopes in accordance with the BACSP and the current proposed IDGP amendment before the Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTC Policy</td>
<td>Update precinct names, preferred precinct land uses (to reflect changed boundaries) and insert reference to the strategic document guidance from the BACSP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCS</td>
<td>Increase permissible shop/retail floorspace within the Centre to 35,931m² NLA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The recommendations of the BACSP are represented in a spatial form in a Structure Plan Map (see Figure 6). The Map incorporates the proposed changes to the IDGP that were adopted by Council in November 2011 (for the purposes of public consultation), and the layout of the Settlers Hills East Structure Plan.
In April 2012, the Council resolved to endorse the advertising of the proposed BACSP. Residential density and retail sustainability were identified as issues requiring further investigation during the advertising period.

A copy of the proposed BACSP, as advertised, is attached.

4. Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community

A notice of the proposed BACSP was published in the “Public Notices” section of the Weekend Courier newspaper on the 11th May 2012, with comment invited by the 11th June 2012. A sign was also erected on Settlers Avenue opposite First Choice providing notice of the proposal. In addition, written notice was provided to all owners within and adjacent to the Centre.
At the conclusion of the comment period, one submission had been received from MGA Town Planners, on behalf of the owner of Lot 9001 (the land north of Settlers Avenue – see Figure 3). A summary of the submission, and the City’s comments in relation to the submission, are included in the following tables.

### 1. Consideration of the proposed IDGP for Lot 9001

**Submission:**
The proposed modification to the IDGP for Lot 9001 (as considered by Council in November 2011) should be considered concurrently with the proposed BACSP.

**City’s comment:**
The proposed modification to the IDGP for Lot 9001 is being considered as a separate process to the BACSP. The BACSP will inform future changes to the IDGP, and as such the IDGP modification for Lot 9001 does not need to be considered concurrently.

### 2. Street-front development

**Submission:**
The BACSP supports a form of expansion where the majority of retail floorspace will be within the enclosed portion of the Centre (the Baldivis Shopping Centre), contrary to the urban form provisions of State Planning Policy 4.2 – Activity Centres for Perth and Peel (SPP4.2) which requires buildings to address the street and large-scale retail and carparks to be 'sleeved' with active frontages.

**City’s comment:**
The BACSP reflects the current approved IDGP. SPP4.2 sets no target for ratios of street-front and mall tenancies. The City’s estimate is that while the current ratio of street-front to mall tenancies is 53%, at full development the ratio could fall to around 47% (including street-front development in Lot 9001). This represents development in accordance with the IDGP that was considered by Council in November 2011, and there is minimal opportunity to increase the ratio of street-front tenancies at this stage. The current provisions of the BTC Policy provide for passive surveillance of streets and public spaces and active uses at ground floor.

### 3. Retail Scale and Retail Type

**Submission:**
The BACSP precludes the development of retail, supermarkets and speciality shops from being developed in Lot 9001, contrary to the proposal to include part of Lot 9001 along Settlers Avenue within the Core Precinct under the proposed changes to the IDGP.

**City’s comment:**
The BACSP supports the development of small-scale retail and other uses within Lot 9001, which could include ‘retail’ and ‘speciality retail’; therefore the City does not interpret the BACSP as preventing retail and speciality retail from being developed within Lot 9001.

The development of a supermarket within Lot 9001 was not a consideration in the November 2011 proposal to amend the IDGP. Should the owner of Lot 9001 propose a supermarket, it should be justified by the submission of a Retail Sustainability Assessment in accordance with SPP4.2.
4. Amendments to the BTC Policy

Submission:
No support is provided for the BTC Policy to be modified reflecting the land use intent, retail scale or residential development on Settlers Avenue in Lot 9001.

City’s comment:
The BACSP supports the land uses proposed by MGA Town Planners for Settlers Avenue in Lot 9001. Amendments to the BTC Policy to facilitate the proposed uses will be considered by the City following the endorsement of the BACSP by the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC).

5. Timing of the Development of Retail Floorspace

Submission:
The proponent’s Retail Sustainability Assessment (RSA) attached to the BACSP supports the development of 2,500m² of shop/retail floorspace within Lot 9001 prior to 2016, subject to it being developed in conjunction with Stockland’s proposed expansion to the Baldy’s Shopping Centre. This restriction conflicts with SPP4.2 which provides that activity centres should contain a mix of uses along street frontages.

City’s comment:
The BACSP document does not propose any timing restrictions or conditions associated with the 2,500m² of shop/retail floorspace in Lot 9001; it states that the 2,500m² floorspace “will complement, but not necessarily compete with the Core Precinct.” This is consistent with the Council’s November 2011 resolution to endorse advertising of the proposed 2,500m² of floorspace in Lot 9001.

In addition to the above, MGA Town Planning provided separate email correspondence questioning requirements for drainage investigations to be undertaken in conjunction with the proposed modification to the IDGP:

6. Drainage

Submission:
The BACSP map includes the following note:

“Drainage allocation subject to further design development as part of future urban water management plan to be prepared at subdivision stage”

This note is inconsistent with the City’s requirement to investigate drainage prior to advertising the proposed modifications to the IDGP for public comment.

City’s comment:
This note is contrary to the City’s November 2011 resolution, and it is recommended that the note be deleted from the BACSP map.

b. Consultation with Government Agencies

Written notice of the proposal was provided to the Town of Kwinana, Department of Planning (DoP), Main Roads Western Australia (MRWA) and Public Transport Authority (PTA). At the conclusion of the comment period, two submissions were received; one from the DoP and one from MRWA. A late submission was also received from the PTA. A summary of the submissions, and the City’s comments in relation to the submissions, are included in the following tables.
7. Upgrading of Safety Bay Road Intersections

Figure 7 - Safety Bay Road Intersections

Submission:

The DoP noted that where the BACSP proposes the upgrading of intersections on Safety Bay Road, investigations should be undertaken to determine whether there are additional land area requirements resulting from the proposed upgrades, and if so to request an amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme to reserve these land area requirements.

MRWA notes that the configuration adopted for the analysis of the Safety Bay Road/Norseman Approach/Burlington Drive intersection is inconsistent with that agreed by it in late 2011.

MRWA also notes that the intersections along Safety Bay Road have been assessed using Sidra Intersection, and recommends that a traffic microsimulation assessment would provide a more accurate model of the operation of Safety Bay Road.

Note: Intersection analysis using Sidra Intersection software (or similar) is used to assess the performance of single intersections, based on the input of empirical data such as intersection design and traffic volumes. Traffic microsimulation simulates the behaviour of individual vehicles in a defined environment to predict likely changes in vehicle patterns resulting from changes to traffic flow or changes to the environment.

City’s comment:

The Transport Assessment attached to the BACSP models the traffic flows in the area and recommends improvements to various intersections on Safety Bay Road before 2031 to maintain satisfactory operation based on an intersection analysis (using Sidra), including:

- Nairn Drive - the west and east roundabout approaches being widened to three lanes;
- Settlers Avenue (three-way) – modifying the north approach to provide two right-turn lanes instead of one;
- Settlers Avenue (four-way) – the east approach being widened to three lanes;
- Norseman Approach/Burlington Drive – on the west approach, a longer right-turn pocket being provided; and
- Baldivis Road – the east approach being widened to three lanes.

Generally, the intersection improvements identified by the BACSP can be accommodated within the existing road reserves, but some widening may be required on the northern approach of Settlers Avenue. The need for road widening relating to intersection improvements should be further investigated upon more detailed intersection analysis prior to applying for any major development for the Baldivis Shopping Centre; the need for road widening should also be balanced against urban design considerations given the importance of Settlers Avenue as the main retail street.
The Norseman Approach/Burlington Drive intersection was assessed using a superseded design; a revised design was more recently approved by MRWA. It is recommended that the intersection be reassessed using traffic microsimulation (see below). The intersection is constrained by existing lots on the eastern side and a high pressure natural gas pipeline on the western side, so there is limited space available to accommodate any road widening requirements.

Given the range of factors that could affect traffic volumes along this length of Safety Bay Road, the City agrees that the performance of the intersections could be more accurately analysed using traffic microsimulation, to ensure that the analysis is robust and responsive to changes in traffic conditions and the road environment. A traffic microsimulation should be undertaken prior to the consideration of any major development or subdivision. ‘Major development’ is defined in SPP4.2 as development resulting in an increase of more than 5,000m² of floorspace; this will include the proposed extension to the Baldivis Shopping Centre.

It is recommended that section 5.4.2 of the BACSP be modified to require a traffic microsimulation of the Safety Bay Road intersections to be undertaken to assess the future performance of the intersections resulting from additional traffic generated by proposed major developments and subdivisions, and intersection upgrades. The microsimulation should analyse the need for additional land area requirements resulting from required intersection upgrades for the eastern side of Settlers Avenue, before consideration is made for development on this corner.

8. Developer Assistance for Upgrading of Safety Bay Road

Submission:
MRWA notes safety issues associated with various intersections along Safety Bay Road have been identified, and recommends that the City explore options for developers to assist the City to address these issues as part of current and future development of the area.

City’s comment:
The BACSP identifies upgrades that will be required to intersections on Safety Bay Road before 2031, but does not attribute the source of additional traffic that results in the need for intersection upgrades. The BACSP provides that the City will assess whether a contribution or part-contribution to the upgrade works is warranted based on the scope and nature of development applications.

It is considered appropriate for major subdivisions and developments to contribute towards road widening or upgrade works where it can be demonstrated that there is a nexus between the proposed subdivision/development and the upgrading works, which will be considered on the merits of each application. It is therefore recommended that section 5.4.2 of the BACSP be modified to require major developments and subdivisions to demonstrate what proportion of additional traffic that warrants intersection upgrades is generated from that development/subdivision, and apportion contributions for road widening or intersection upgrades accordingly.

9. Settlers Avenue/Safety Bay Road Intersection

Submission:
The DoP supported the Safety Bay Road/Settlers Avenue remaining as a three-way signalised intersection, with no vehicle connection to the south.

MRWA notes that there has been various discussions and negotiations between MRWA, the City of Rockingham and Stockland associated with access to and from Safety Bay Road and associated traffic management measures, which should be fulfilled.
City’s comment:

The agreements MRWA refers to in its letter were acknowledged by the City in May 2006, when it agreed to prevent any access road from the southern side of Safety Bay Road to connect into the Settlers Avenue intersection. MRWA also requested that the City agree that when traffic numbers on Safety Bay Road become so great that vehicles queue back through Nairn Drive, the traffic signals at Settlers Avenue will be removed and the Nairn Drive/Safety Bay Road roundabout will be replaced with a signalised intersection.

The Council considered the matter in February 2009 when it supported a Structure Plan that showed a cul-de-sac terminating at the southern side of the Safety Bay Road/Settlers Avenue intersection, on the basis that it allowed the potential for a four-way intersection to be created in the future, should this be possible.

The BACSP states; “if the Nairn Drive and Safety Bay Road intersection fails, the roundabout will need to be removed and replaced with traffic lights. At this point in time, it should be investigated if there is any opportunity to review the existing 3-way intersection at the junction of Settlers Avenue and Safety Bay Road to replace it with a 4-way intersection controlled with traffic lights that are phased with the Nairn Drive and Safety Bay Road lights.”

The provision of the four-way intersection could have the effect of improving the operation of other intersections on Safety Bay Road. As such, any future analysis of intersections on Safety Bay Road should include a scenario that includes the conversion of the Nairn Drive roundabout to a signalised intersection, and the conversion of the Settlers Avenue intersection to a four-way signalised intersection, so that the merits, constraints and implications of the scenario can be further investigated.

It is recommended that section 5.4.2 of the BACSP be modified to include a requirement for future analyses of Safety Bay Road intersections, as a precursor to major development and subdivisions, to include the above scenario.
10. Bus Routes

Figure 8 - Bus Routes and Bus Stops Identified in the BACSP

Submission:
The PTA generally supports the indicative future bus routes identified in the BACSP, but notes that it only envisages buses travelling north along Nairn Drive and Settlers Avenue. Buses servicing Baldivis South will travel via Nairn Drive when deviating via the Town Centre.

City’s comment:
The BACSP shows route 568 travelling north from the Centre through the Baldivis Central estate via Norseman Approach, which is in accordance with the PTA’s advice dated 15th August 2005 on the Baldivis Central Structure Plan (the developed area immediately north of the Centre). This route runs central through the catchment with a high level of accessibility and has been constructed to accommodate buses, and is preferred over a route via Nairn Drive which has limited accessibility due to it being a high-speed environment, limited connectivity to residential areas and on the edge of the Urban zone. For this reason, it is recommended that route 568 be retained without modification.

The BACSP shows routes 566 and 567 travelling to the Centre via Norseman Approach and Mennock Approach (no deviation), which is considered to be a direct and legible route that provides maximum accessibility with minimal inconvenience to passengers travelling to and from Wambro. The alternative of routes deviating through the Centre via Nairn Drive will either require routes to double-up over a portion of Safety Bay Road or travel down Settlers Avenue contra-flow, with reduced legibility for passengers and less accessibility. For this reason, it is recommended that routes 566 and 567 be retained without modification.

Route 565 is shown servicing the Centre by looping via Nairn Drive, in accordance with the PTA’s recommendation.

All routes shown in the BACSP are indicative only, and the final routes will be determined by the PTA at the time that each route is commissioned.
11. Bus Stop Locations

Submission:
The PTA does not support indicative bus stop locations being shown (see Figure 8 above), as actual bus stop locations are determined based on a multitude of on-site factors. It is impractical to identify bus stop locations at this time.

City’s comment:
It is acknowledged that it is impractical to identify final bus stop locations in the BACSP, but there are some advantages in identifying indicative bus stop locations up-front, including the ability for bus stop infrastructure (or provision for) to be provided up-front based on indicative stop locations. This is especially important in the Centre where most verge areas will be given up for on-street parking leaving minimal space for bus stop infrastructure. The identification of indicative bus stops is also a requirement of Liveable Neighbourhoods so that it can be established that well-located bus stops can be provided within 250m of all parts of the Centre.

It is recommended that the BACSP be modified to include text noting that the bus stop location are indicative only, and that subdividers should liaise with the Public Transport Authority prior to subdivisional works to identify suitable locations to provide bus stop infrastructure (in lieu of constructing on-street parking embayments).

12. Perth-Bunbury Fast Rail

Submission:
The PTA notes that no stations are envisaged within the Metropolitan Area on the proposed Perth-Bunbury fast railway.

City’s comment:
Given a station is not proposed on the proposed Perth-Bunbury fast railway in the Metropolitan Area, it is recommended that reference to this future railway be deleted from the BACSP.

c. Strategic

Community Plan
This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration contained in the Community Plan 2011:-

**Aspiration 11:** Planning for populate growth to ensure that future development and land-uses contribute to a sustainable city that provides for a genuinely desirable lifestyle.

d. Policy

**SPP4.2 - Activity Centres for Perth and Peel**
The BACSP is being progressed under the guidance of SPP4.2 (Activity Centres for Perth and Peel). As indicated in the City’s April 2011 report to the Planning Services Committee, the BACSP complies with the requirements of SPP4.2, except for the issues of residential density and the Retail Sustainability Assessment (RSA) which were to be investigated in more detail during the public consultation period. Consideration of these issues is included in the following tables.
13. Residential Density

Details:
The BACSP provides indicative residential densities based for the short-term and the long-term. It demonstrates that the Centre can accommodate 999 dwellings in the short-term, based on full development using the existing densities set out in the BTC Policy and the Settlers Hills East Structure Plan. This equates to a density of 13.8 dwellings per gross hectare (d/gha), which fails to achieve the minimum 20d/gha or desirable 30d/gha targets set by SPP4.2. The BACSP does not propose increases to the density requirements of the BTC Policy or the Settlers Hills East Structure Plan.

The BACSP proposes a long-term density that exceeds 20d/gha based on the redevelopment of various sites (carparks and buildings) on Settlers Avenue and the northern side of Safety Bay Road, to facilitate 518 additional dwellings. Redevelopment to facilitate the long-term density is not able to be achieved in the short-term because of economic constraints and requires owners of various sites to voluntarily redevelop existing sites to accommodate this aspirational residential development, and accordingly amendments to the BTC Policy and the IDGP to implement the long-term plan are not proposed.

City’s comment:
During the public consultation period, a meeting was held with the proponent and the DoP to discuss the issue of densities. The DoP confirmed that although SPP4.2 contains density targets, it acknowledges that there are constraints in achieving the required densities including the economic and market feasibility of achieving higher-density development, the format of existing and approved subdivision and developments, limited employment and recreational opportunities in the Centre and limited access to public transport in the short term. With such constraints, modification of the BTC Policy or the Settlers Hill East Structure Plan to increase minimum densities is unviable and would constrain development in the short to medium term. The BACSP therefore does not propose any modifications to the BTC Policy or the Structure Plan to alter residential densities.

It is recommended that the BACSP clarify that implementation of the short-term plan does not require any changes to be made to the BTC Policy or the Settlers Hills East Structure Plan, and that the recommendations of the long-term plan be investigated in more detail should the BACSP be reviewed in the future.

14. Retail Sustainability Assessment

Details:
The proposal is accompanied by a RSA which concludes that there is significant unmet market demand for retail facilities in Baldivis, the assessed impact on any one centre is manageable, and the proposed extension would not be expected to adversely impact the role, function and viability of other activity centres.

City’s comment:
During the public consultation period, the City’s retail consultant, MacroPlan Dimasi, conducted a thorough review of the RSA and advised that it has no significant inaccuracies which are likely to significantly impact on the output and therefore the recommendations of the report for higher order retailing. The expansion of the Centre is therefore not considered likely to have a significant impact on the viability of other centres in Baldivis.

SPP4.2 requires that the responsible authority for endorsing an activity centre structure plan for district centres greater than 20,000m² is the WAPC. As such, the City is required to forward the BACSP to the WAPC for its endorsement.
Planning Policy 3.2.4 - Baldivis Town Centre

The BACSP provides recommendations that should be implemented into the BTC Policy. Upon review of the BACSP, it is apparent that modifications that will be required to the BTC Policy include:-

- The introduction section to be modified to include reference to the BACSP;
- Introduce the Centre Vision from the BACSP;
- Modifications to reflect the precinct names used in the BACSP, by renaming “General Precinct” to “Transition Precinct”, and “South-East Precinct” to “Eastern Precinct”;
- Include discount department store and supermarket as new preferred uses in the Core Precinct;
- Include small-scale retail, convenience stores, personal services and service industry as new preferred uses in the Transition Precinct;
- Include service industries and eating and drinking places as new preferred uses in the Eastern Precinct;
- Require a traffic microsimulation of the Safety Bay Road intersections to be prepared to determine required intersection upgrades, land areas requirements and proportional contributions required for the identified works, prior to major development or subdivision;
- Require subdividers to make provision for bus stop infrastructure;
- Provision of pedestrian and cycle infrastructure along the linear park, including crossing facilities at Safety Bay Road;
- Require footpaths on all streets in accordance with Liveable Neighbourhoods, including footpaths on both sides of Safety Bay Road;
- Provide for highway commercial style development adjacent to Safety Bay Road in the Core Precinct in the medium term;
- Require waterwise plants to be incorporated into all landscaping proposals;
- Encourage developers to consider innovative greywater and stormwater infrastructure;
- Prohibit the use of tinting of ground-floor windows; and
- Require pedestrian awnings for all streetfront buildings.

These changes will be progressed following the WAPC’s endorsement of the BACSP.

Local Commercial Strategy

The BACSP supports a total shop/retail floorspace of 35,931m² (which includes 2,500m² within Lot 9001) within the Centre, based on the proponent’s RSA. It proposes that the LCS be amended to reflect the proposed shop/retail floorspace.

The City is currently progressing a review of the LCS as it applies to the Baldivis area. It is proposed that the matter of floorspace within the Centre be considered as part of the LCS review. In the interim, the City will support proposals for retail development based on the recommendations of the RSA.

Integrated Development Guide Plan

The proposed changes to the IDGP as supported by the Council in November 2011 should proceed, subject to the precinct names being modified to reflect those used in the BACSP.

e. **Financial**

   Not applicable

f. **Legal and Statutory**

   There are no legal or statutory requirements relating to an activity centre structure plan; content and procedural requirements are set out in SPP4.2.
5. **Comments**

The proposed BACSP has been subject to a thorough assessment by the City, including consultation with affected owners and government agencies. The BACSP is considered to be suitable for endorsement, subject to the following amendments being made to the document as explained in the “Implications” section above:-

- Section 5.2 - Include text noting that the bus stop locations are indicative only, and that subdividers should liaise with the Public Transport Authority prior to subdivisional works to identify suitable locations to provide bus stop infrastructure (in lieu of constructing on-street parking embayments);

- Section 5.2 – Delete reference to the Perth-Bunbury fast railway;

- Section 5.4.2 – Include a requirement for all major development and subdivision applications to include a traffic microsimulation of the Safety Bay Road intersections to assess the future performance of the intersections resulting from additional traffic generated by the proposal, intersection upgrades and land area requirements. The traffic microsimulation should model a scenario where the Nairn Drive/Safety Bay Road roundabout intersection is converted to a signalised intersection, and the Settlers Avenue/Safety Bay Road intersection modified to a four-way signalised intersection with a connection to the south, so that the merits of constraints of this scenario can be established. The analysis should also determine what proportion of additional traffic that warrants intersection upgrades is generated from that development/subdivision, and apportion contributions for road widening or intersection upgrades accordingly;

- Section 6.3 – Include text clarifying that implementation of the short-term dwelling yield plan does not require any changes to be made to the BTC Policy or the Settlers Hills East Structure Plan, and that the recommendations of the long-term dwelling yield plan be investigated in more detail should the BACSP be reviewed in the future; and

- BACSP Map – delete Note 10 (relating to drainage).

In addition to the above changes, several minor errors or omissions have been identified that require addressing before the BACSP is forwarded to the WAPC for endorsement:-

- Section 5.6 – The text “As part of any Development Application for development on the shopping centre site, there is no requirement for additional car parking above the scheme requirements for the shopping centre to be provided, to meet the car parking requirements that would be generated under the scheme for development on lots 7 and 8” should be deleted, as this statement is incorrect. The car parking for Lots 7 and 8 Settlers Avenue has been constructed on the Shopping Centre site, in accordance with the agreements that were prepared at the time of subdivision, in lieu of the parking being provided on the sites;

- Section 6.5.4 – Residential should not be listed as a preferred use in the Eastern Precinct, as per the associated text;

- Section 6.5.2 – Service Industry should be listed as a preferred use in the Transition Precinct, as per the associated text; and

- Section 8.3 should include street awnings as an energy saving measure.

It is recommended that once the above modifications have been made to the BACSP, the BACSP should be forwarded to the WAPC for its endorsement under SPP4.2.

6. **Voting Requirements**

Simple majority

7. **Officer Recommendation**

That Council **ENDORSE** the Baldivis Activity Centre Structure Plan, subject to the following modifications being made to the document:-

1. Section 5.2 - Include text noting that the bus stop location are indicative only;

2. Section 5.2 – Delete reference to the Perth-Bunbury fast railway;
3. Section 5.4.2 – Include a requirement for all major development and subdivision applications to include a traffic microsimulation of the Safety Bay Road intersections;
4. Section 5.6 – Delete the text relating to shared car parking requirements for the Baldivis Shopping Centre;
5. Section 6.3 – Include text clarifying the implementation of the short-term dwelling yield plan and future investigations of the recommendations of the long-term dwelling yield plan;
6. Section 6.5.4 – Delete “Residential” as a preferred use in the Eastern Precinct;
7. Section 6.5.2 – Include “Service Industry” as a preferred use in the Transition Precinct;
8. Section 8.3 - Include street awnings as an energy saving measure; and

8. Committee Recommendation

That Council ENDORSE the Baldivis Activity Centre Structure Plan, subject to the following modifications being made to the document:-

1. Section 5.2 - Include text noting that the bus stop location are indicative only;
2. Section 5.2 – Delete reference to the Perth-Bunbury fast railway;
3. Section 5.4.2 – Include a requirement for all major development and subdivision applications to include a traffic microsimulation of the Safety Bay Road intersections;
4. Section 5.6 – Delete the text relating to shared car parking requirements for the Baldivis Shopping Centre;
5. Section 6.3 – Include text clarifying the implementation of the short-term dwelling yield plan and future investigations of the recommendations of the long-term dwelling yield plan;
6. Section 6.5.4 – Delete “Residential” as a preferred use in the Eastern Precinct;
7. Section 6.5.2 – Include “Service Industry” as a preferred use in the Transition Precinct;
8. Section 8.3 - Include street awnings as an energy saving measure; and
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9. The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation

Not applicable

10. Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation

Not applicable
### 1. Purpose of Report

To consider disbanding the Community Environment Advisory Committee in permanent recess.

### 2. Recommendations to the Planning Services Committee

#### 2.1 Advisory Committee Recommendation 1: Future Role of the Community Environment Advisory Committee

That Council place the Community Environment Advisory Committee in permanent recess.

### Background

In 1994, the Council established the Conservation Reserves & Foreshore Management Advisory Committee (‘CRAFMAC’), with its main purpose being to 'advise and assist Council in the management of conservation and foreshore reserves’. In 2001, it was determined that, due to the increasing scope of Council's environmental activities, it was appropriate that the role of CRAFMAC, the Council's only environmental advisory committee, be re-examined. As part of the review the group was retitled the Community Environment Advisory Committee (‘CEAC’), and in April 2002, the Council endorsed the Terms of Reference for CEAC and supported advertising for nominations.

CEAC consists of a Councillor (currently Cr Smith) as Presiding Member and four community representatives, and typically meets bi-monthly. It provides a forum for the community representatives to be informed and provide input on relevant environmental initiatives, and to raise relevant matters with the City.

Over the past year, CEAC has had several discussions regarding its role in the City’s environmental projects. At the most recent meeting, held on the 7th June 2012, CEAC discussed the matter further and concluded that it was unable to provide meaningful input into significant environmental proposals as a result statutory time constraints, and was not providing substantial input into projects. In light of the above, it was recommended that CEAC be placed into permanent recess.
CEAC is intended to engage on matters relating to the conservation and sustainable use of Rockingham’s natural environment, particularly with respect to repair and rehabilitation works. With respect to repair and rehabilitation works, it is noted that the Regional Parks Management Committee already provides a platform for community input into such initiatives.

As such, the opportunity for CEAC to engage on matters relating to the conservation and sustainable use of Rockingham’s natural environment rests primarily with the assessment of major proposals, and preparation of the City’s Local Planning Strategy. Due to statutory time constraints, it is not feasible for the City to adequately brief and engage with CEAC members as part of the environment assessment process. With respect to the Local Planning Strategy, the City will be undertaking a comprehensive community engagement process which will provide opportunity for meaningful input from the community on matters relating to conservation and sustainability. Other major planning initiatives are also subject to advertising processes which allow for community input.

In light of the above, it is considered that the purpose and intent of CEAC to allow for community input on environmental matters can be met through other existing Committee’s and robust community engagement processes relating to specific matters. As such, CEAC’s recommendation is supported and it is recommended that it be disbanded.

### Implications to Consider

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **a. Strategic**  | Community Plan  
This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspirations contained in the Community Plan 2011:-  
**Aspiration 9:**  Planning systems, infrastructure standards and community awareness programs that serve to acknowledge and mitigate the impacts of climate change.  
**Aspiration 10:**  Coastal and bushland reserves that are well utilised and managed in a way that will preserve them for future generations to enjoy. |
| **b. Policy**     | Governance and Framework Policy |
| **c. Financial**  | Nil |
| **d. Legal and Statutory** | Nil |
| **e. Voting Requirements** | Absolute Majority |

### Officer Recommendation if Different to Advisory Committee Recommendation

That Council **DISBAND** the Community Environment Advisory Committee.

### The Officer’s Reason for Varying the Advisory Committee Recommendation

To make it more clear that the Community Environment Advisory Committee intends to be disbanded.

### 3. Committee Recommendation

That Council **DISBAND** the Community Environment Advisory Committee.
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### 4. The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation

Not applicable
5. Implications of the Changes to the Officer's Recommendation

Not applicable
### Planning Services

**Statutory Planning Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>SP-044/12</th>
<th>Proposed Extension of Hours to Approved Home Occupation (Dog Grooming)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>28/6337</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>Ms H Weir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Miss Donna Shaw, Planning Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td>Mr Dave Waller, Coordinator Statutory Planning</td>
<td>Mr Mike Ross, Manager Statutory Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>16th July 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td>November 2011 (SP-055)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td>Tribunal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site:</th>
<th>Lot 59 (No.4) Bass Court, Waikiki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area:</td>
<td>703m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Zoning:</td>
<td>Residential (R20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS Zoning:</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td>1. Schedule of Submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps/Diagrams:</td>
<td>1. Location Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Consultation Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Location Plan

1. Purpose of Report

To consider an application seeking to extend the hours of operation of an approved Home Occupation (Dog Grooming) at Lot 59 (No.4) Bass Court, Waikiki.

2. Background

In August 2011, a complaint was received that a dog grooming business was operating from Lot 59 (No.4) Bass Court, Waikiki. The complainant raised concern regarding the noise generated by the barking of the owner’s two dogs when customers attended the property. The complainant also identified that the client’s dogs, and the resident’s two dogs, on occasion, were unrestrained and allowed to roam onto adjoining properties. The issue of having to clean up dog excrement was another issue identified.

In November 2001, an application for Planning Approval was approved by Council subject to the following conditions:

1. The Home Occupation must only be operated from the garage, and the garage door must remain closed when grooming/washing dogs.
2. Clients must not be permitted to attend the premises except by appointment and, with an interval of at least 15 minutes between clients.
3. Appointments must only occur between the hours of 10:00am to 2:00pm, Mondays to Fridays, and not at all on weekends.
4. The occupier’s dogs must be restrained within the backyard or dwelling when clients attend the premises.
5. All wastewater must be disposed of into the Water Corporation sewer.
6. All materials and/or equipment used in relation to the Home Occupation must be stored within the residence, shed and/or rear yard, behind property fences, at all times.”

Since the 2011 Planning Approval was granted, the City has received a complaint that the Home Occupation has been operating outside of the permitted hours. The proponent was advised of the need to comply with the conditions of Approval. The proponent responded by lodging a further application for Planning Approval to modify the hours of operation.
3. Details

The proponent seeks Council approval to extend the operating hours of the Home Occupation from 10:00am to 2:00pm, Mondays to Fridays, and not at all on weekends to the revised hours of 9:00am to 5:00pm, Mondays to Fridays, and Saturdays from 10:00am to 3:00pm.

4. Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community

In accordance with Planning Policy 3.3.10 – Home Occupations & Home Businesses (‘the Policy’), the application was referred to adjacent and affected land owners for comment for a period of 14 days.

At close of the advertising period, two submissions of objection were received, which raised the following concerns with the proposal:-

(i) Noise. A submission raised the issue that the barking dogs disturb the amenity of neighbours;

(ii) Non-compliance with conditions of Planning Approval. A submission was concerned that the original conditions of planning approval were not being complied with; and

(iii) Increased Traffic. Concerns were raised about the increase in traffic flow in the cul-de-sac, which would cause a noise disturbance to the surrounding residential properties and safety concerns.

The consultation plan shows the properties consulted and the location of the submissioners:-

b. Consultation with Government Agencies

Not Applicable
c. **Strategic**

**Community Plan**

This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration contained in the Community Plan 2011:-

**Aspiration 11:** Planning for population growth to ensure that future development and land-uses contribute to a sustainable city that provides for a genuinely desirable lifestyle

d. **Policy**

Planning Policy 3.3.10 – Home Occupations and Home Businesses (the Policy) sets out policy objectives and provisions which the Council must have regard to in the assessment and determination of applications for planning approval for Home Occupations and Home Businesses.

The objectives of the Policy are as follows:-

“(a) To promote the orderly and proper development of land by making suitable provisions to guide applicants who wish to operate a Home Occupation or a Home Business from a dwelling;

(b) To secure the amenity, health and convenience of the neighbourhood through appropriate development requirements; and

(c) To provide for economic growth and employment opportunities by facilitating the development of home based businesses.”

The Policy assessment criteria includes, among other requirements:

(i) Method of Operation – The operation of the Home Occupation must not cause injury to or adversely affect the amenity of the neighbourhood.

The key issue to consider on the proposal is whether or not approval to extend the hours of operation is consistent with the residential amenity of the area, and if an approval is likely to result in further resident complaints regarding barking dogs.

Given the neighbour objections received regarding barking dogs, the proposed extension of operation hours is considered inconsistent with the Policy objectives (a) and (b) above and the Policy assessment criteria for the method of operation.

e. **Financial**

Not applicable

f. **Legal and Statutory**

A Home Occupation is a (‘D’) use that is not permitted in the Residential Zone, unless the Council has exercised its discretion by granting Planning Approval.

---

5. **Comments**

**Response to Submissions**

With respect to the issues raised in the submissions, the following comments are made:-

**Noise**

Submissioners raised concerns that there was disturbance and noise generated when clients attended the premises due to their dogs and the owner dogs is barking.

The issue of dogs barking is difficult to control. Ensuring that dogs are only groomed in the garage with the garage door closed is considered to be a suitable means to allow the operation of the Home Occupation, but there is still the potential for the client’s and the proponent’s dogs barking when the dogs are dropped off and collected from the premises. Extending the operation hours is likely to exacerbate this issue.

It is considered that the operating hours should not be extended. This would still enable the dog grooming business to operate, provided that it complies with the 2011 Planning Approval.
Non-compliance with conditions of Planning Approval

The proponent has admitted operating outside of the permitted operating hours and the City’s Compliance Officers have investigated a complaint from a neighbouring property regarding the breaches of the permitted operating hours. Given the proponent has previously breached the conditions of Planning Approval, the concerns are considered valid regarding the ability of the proponent to comply with the conditions.

Compliance with the Planning Approval will continue to be monitored by the City.

Increased Traffic

A maximum of 3 clients per day are expected to attend the premises. The impact on traffic in Bass Court from extending the hours of operation is unlikely to impact on the amenity of the area. Traffic impacts are considered manageable.

b. Conclusion

Extending the hours of operation is likely to compromise the residential amenity of the area and increase the likelihood of dogs barking. It is recommended that the application to extend the hours of operation of the Dog Grooming business be refused.

6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

7. Officer Recommendation

That Council REFUSE the application to extend the operating hours of the Home Occupation (Dog Grooming) at Lot 59 (No.4) Bass Court, Warnbro, as an extension of operating hours will adversely affect the residential amenity of the locality and be contrary to orderly and proper planning principles.

8. Committee Recommendation

That Council REFUSE the application to extend the operating hours of the Home Occupation (Dog Grooming) at Lot 59 (No.4) Bass Court, Warnbro, as an extension of operating hours will adversely affect the residential amenity of the locality and be contrary to orderly and proper planning principles.
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9. The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation

Not applicable

10. Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation

Not applicable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Reference No &amp; Subject:</strong></th>
<th>SP-045/12 Proposed Twenty (20) Multiple Dwellings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>File No:</strong></td>
<td>28/6474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proponent/s:</strong></td>
<td>Yaran Property Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Author:</strong></td>
<td>Ms Erika Barton, Senior Planning Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Contributors:</strong></td>
<td>Mr Dave Waller, Coordinator, Statutory Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Mike Ross, Manager, Statutory Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date of Committee Meeting:</strong></td>
<td>16th July 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previously before Council:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disclosure of Interest:</strong></td>
<td>Tribunal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</strong></td>
<td>Tribunal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site:</strong></td>
<td>Lots 491 and 492 (Nos.49 and 51) Lewington Street, Rockingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lot Area:</strong></td>
<td>2,034m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LA Zoning:</strong></td>
<td>Residential (R30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MRS Zoning:</strong></td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attachments:</strong></td>
<td>1. Submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Location Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Development Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Consultation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Zoning and R-Codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Locality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. 52-54 Lewington Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. 52-54 Lewington Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. 44-46 Lewington Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Purpose of Report**

To consider an application seeking planning approval for 20 Multiple Dwellings at Lots 491 and 492 (Nos. 49 and 51) Lewington Street, Rockingham.
2. Background

Nil

3. Details

The proponent seeks approval for 20 Multiple Dwellings, which includes two, two-storey buildings, with each building containing ten dwellings. Each building layout has five dwellings located on the ground floor and five dwellings located on the first floor. Each dwelling includes two bedrooms.

A common central driveway would service the development. Twenty resident car parking spaces that are semi covered and six (6) uncovered visitor car parking spaces are proposed.

The proponent seeks approval for building setback variations to the Acceptable Development Criteria of the R-Codes. The proposed variations are as follows:-

Variation 1 The R-Codes requires a Plot Ratio of 0.5 for R30 Coded land. The development proposes a 0.57 Plot Ratio.

Variation 2 The R-Codes require front fences and walls within the primary street setback to be visually permeable above 1.2m. The front fence is proposed to be solid in parts to 1.8m.

Variation 3 The R-Codes require filling behind a street setback line within 1m of a common boundary is not to be more than 0.5m above the natural ground level. The development proposes filling in the north eastern corner of the site to 0.53m.

Variation 4 The R-Codes require developments that contain more than 12 dwellings to provide a minimum of 20% of the dwellings as one-bedroom dwellings. The development only provides two-bedroom dwellings.

Variation 5 The R-Codes requires a 4m² storage area with a minimum dimension of 1.5m to be provided. The minimum dimension of the storage areas is 1m.

4. Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community

In accordance with clause 6.3 of Town Planning Scheme No.2 (TPS2) and clause 4.1 of the R-Codes, the application was referred to nearby owners and occupiers for comment, for a period of 14 days. Advertising of the proposal was undertaken by the City because the R-Code variations required the exercise of discretion by the Council and this required consultation with the nearby property owners and occupiers that could be affected by the proposal.
3. Consultation Plan

At the close of the advertising period, ten submissions had been received. Nine raised objection to the development and one provided support for the development. The submissions raised the following main concerns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission concern</th>
<th>No. of Submissions Raised the Concern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plot Ratio Variation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistent with existing character</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles and Traffic Generation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient parking on site</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise, including from bin storage area, vehicle turning circle and people and vehicles</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overshadowing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detrimental effect on lifestyle</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other more suitable sites</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of Privacy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High rental population and associated impacts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking problem on bin collection day</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Values</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruption to rear fence and garden</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set precedent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission concern</th>
<th>No. of Submissions Raised the Concern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create social problems</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of notification</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient kerbside bin storage and bin number</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. **Consultation with Government Agencies**

Not Applicable

c. **Strategic**

**Community Plan**

This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration contained in the Community Plan 2011:-

**Aspiration 11:** Planning for population growth to ensure that future development and land-uses contribute to a sustainable city that provides for a genuinely desirable lifestyle.

d. **Policy**

**State Planning Policy 3.1 – Residential Design Codes**

In November 2012, amendments were made to State Planning Policy 3.1 - Residential Design Codes (R-Codes) which involved *inter alia* the removal of the minimum site area for multiple dwellings in areas with a coding of R30 or greater to allow more flexibility in design and internal layout. New tables which outline new plot ratios, site covers, height controls and setbacks for multiple dwellings, were introduced to control the density of development instead.

The objectives of the amendments to the R-Codes were to:-

"(i) Expand the permissible range of housing within residential coding, so as to more effectively meet the housing needs of the community;"

"(ii) Facilitate the development and redevelopment of existing housing sites;"

"(iii) Reduce the disincentive for smaller dwellings in favour of increased density of housing within a framework of form-based design guidance;"

"(iv) Improve the standard of design for Multi-Unit housing, and encourage the development of housing with performance standards appropriate to form; and"

"(v) Build the capacity of local government to interpret and apply new methods for assessment and promotion of Multi-Unit housing and Mixed-Use development."

The result of these changes was the increased ability to carry out multiple dwellings.

The proposed development generally complies with the R-Codes. The following outlines the proposed variations to the acceptable development provisions within the R Codes and justification for variations. Acceptable development requirements illustrate one way of satisfying the corresponding Performance Criteria.

**Plot Ratio**

For R30 coded land, the acceptable development requirement for building size is a plot ratio of 0.5. The development proposes a plot ratio of 0.57, which exceeds the requirement by 0.07. The Plot Ratio variation would permit three extra multiple dwellings. Plot Ratio is the ratio of the floor area of all buildings on the site, to the area of land in the site boundaries. The performance criterion for plot ratio is:

“Development of the building is at a bulk and scale indicated in the local planning scheme and is consistent with the existing or future desired built form of the locality.”

Despite varying the plot ratio, the development achieves the intent of the performance criteria and all other development controls such as setbacks, building height, parking requirements, overshadowing, and visual privacy.
The land on the northern side of Lewington Street, and the two lots immediately behind the subject site, have a coding of R40. R40 coded land has a plot ratio of 0.6 (see Figure 4). Thus the plot ratio exceedance on the subject site would not be inconsistent with the potential density of development in front of and behind the site.

The density of development would be consistent with the proposal for higher residential densities in this area of the Rockingham Strategic Metropolitan Centre. The Rockingham Strategic Regional Centre: Centre Plan outlines the plans for this area. The site is within the Northern Waterfront Sector (Sector 9) of this Plan, which envisages medium to high density residential development. Specifically, it identifies the site as having a preferred density of 80-100 dwellings/hectare (R80-R100) and buildings to have a height of 2-6 storeys.

Considering the above, the Plot Ratio variation is consistent with the desired character in terms of scale.

4. Zoning and R-Codes

Street Walls and Fences

The acceptable development requirements of the R-Codes require front fences and walls within the Lewington Street setback to be visually permeable above 1.2m. The proposed front fence is solid up to a height of 1.8m.

The performance criteria of this control is as follows:

“Front walls and fences to enable surveillance and enhance streetscape.”

The front fence only spans part of the length of the front boundary. The height is required to provide privacy to the courtyards of Units 1 and 11 and to provide screening of the bin storage areas.

The part of the fencing bounding the courtyard contains infill panels. It is recommended that these infill panels be spaced to enable visual permeability above 1.2m. The front façade of the bin storage areas shall also include infill panels to break up the blank façade above 1.2m. These panels shall be consistent with the panels in the courtyard fence.

By undertaking the above, the front fencing will comply with the R-Codes.
Site Works

The acceptable development requirements of the R-Codes require filling behind a street setback line and within one metre of a common boundary not to be more than 0.5m above the natural ground level. The development originally proposed filling of up to 0.93m along the north eastern rear boundary. Negotiation with the proponent has dropped the filling in this location to 0.53m.

The performance criteria of this control is:

“Development that retains the visual impression of the natural level of a site, as seen from the street or other public place, or from an adjoining property.
Retaining walls designed or set back to minimise the impact on adjoining properties.”

The filling is required to facilitate levels suitable for the development and in particular the common driveway. There are no adverse amenity issues, such as visual privacy issues or overshadowing, resulting from the R-Code variation relating to site levels. The proponent has adequately addressed this matter by reducing the design levels which reduces the impact of retaining walls. It is considered acceptable to support this variation.

Dwelling Size

The acceptable development requirements of the R-Codes require a minimum of 20% of the dwellings to be one bedroom units. The development proposes all the dwellings as two bedroom dwellings.

The performance criteria of this control is:

“Each dwelling within the development is of a sufficient size to cater for the needs of the residents. The development must provide diversity in dwellings to ensure that a range of types and sizes is provided.”

The development is an affordable housing development. As such it is considered to provide for a different part of the housing market compared to surrounding development. In this regard it is considered to be acceptable.

Essential Facilities

The acceptable development requirements of the R-Codes require a 4m² storage area, with a minimum dimension of 1.5m to be provided for each dwelling. A 4m² storage area has been provided for each dwelling, but they all have a minimum dimension of 1m and side access.

The performance criteria for this control is:

“Provision made for external storage, rubbish collection/storage areas and clothes-drying areas that are:
- Adequate for the needs of residents; and
- Without detriment to the amenity of the locality.”

This minor variation is considered to be reasonable as it provides for a functional storage room, for the storage of longer items, such as bikes.

e. Financial

Nil

f. Legal and Statutory

Town Planning Scheme No.2

In TPS2, the proposed development is classed as a Multiple Dwelling, which is a (‘D’) use that is not permitted in the Residential Zone, unless the Council has exercised its discretion by granting planning approval. The residential density code shown on the Scheme Maps is R30, which designates the site for Grouped Dwellings. Clause 4.1 of TPS2 requires residential development, unless otherwise provided for in TPS2, to comply with the R-Codes. The Council has discretion to either approve the proposal, with or without conditions, or refuse the application.
5. Comments

Response to Submissions

Plot Ratio Exceedance

Officer comments regarding plot ratio variation are provided above under the Policy Section.

Inconsistent with existing character

There are existing two storey Grouped and Multiple Dwelling developments in Lewington Street. Whilst these developments do not have the same number of dwellings in total, the bulk of the buildings are considered to be similar to the proposed development. These existing developments can be seen on Figures 5 to 8, to the north of the subject site.

The area of Lewington Street is undergoing substantial change, because the zoning of land permits infill medium density residential development. There is a need for the new development to be built to the expectations of the desired form, without impacting on the amenity levels enjoyed by existing neighbours. It is considered that the proposed development responds to the spatial setting and existing character in which it is located.

5. Locality
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PRESIDING MEMBER
Vehicles and Traffic Generation

As part of the City’s Rockingham Strategic Regional Centre: Centre Plan, traffic modelling was undertaken. Preliminary traffic modelling indicates that there is sufficient capacity to cater for the anticipated development of the area. The City’s Engineering Services has assessed the application and raised no concern regarding vehicle numbers or traffic generation.

Insufficient parking on site

Being less than 75m² in area, each multiple dwelling is required to have one on-site parking space. This has been provided. Further, 0.25 spaces per dwelling are required for Visitors’ parking. Based on 20 dwellings, five Visitor spaces are required, whilst six have been provided.

The parking spaces proposed comply with the requirements of the R-Codes.

Noise

Objectors raised concerns regarding an increase in noise as a result of more living in the development. The development has been designed to minimise impact on adjoining properties through a central driveway and parking areas, the bin storage areas located in enclosed bins storage areas, stairwells are enclosed, balconies are internally oriented, and ground floor courtyards are not elevated. The bins are also to be stored in 1.8m high brick enclosures.

The vehicle manoeuvring area is centrally located and screened by buildings and 1.8m high fencing to minimise any noise impact from vehicles entering or exiting their car parking space.

Any air conditioners must also be located to ensure compliance with the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997.

Overshadowing

The proponent has provided overshadowing diagrams for 21st June, being the shortest day of the year and providing worst case scenario overshadowing impacts. The plans comply with the R-Code requirements for overshadowing.

CONFFIRMED AT A PLANNING SERVICES MEETING
HELD ON MONDAY, 20 AUGUST 2012

PRESIDING MEMBER
Detrimental effect on lifestyle

The development is unlikely to have an adverse impact, as the development complies with the R-Codes regarding overshadowing, visual privacy, etc. In this regard, the development is not expected to have an adverse impact on the lifestyle of adjoining residents.

Other more suitable sites

It is not relevant to consider other sites for the proposed development. The application before the City is for the subject site, and thus assessment has been undertaken for this site only.

Loss of Privacy

The development complies with the visual privacy requirements of the R-Codes. Specifically there are no major openings of the dwellings that directly overlook any adjacent residential properties. All windows facing the adjoining properties are high sill windows on the first floor level, or will be screened by the boundary fence for ground floor openings.

High rental population and associated impacts

This is not a relevant planning consideration.

Parking problem on bin collection day

On-site car parking complies with the R-Codes. The site has three bus routes within 500-600m, including a high frequency route to the railway station. Thus public transport is available in the vicinity of the site to assist with discouraging multiple private car ownership.

Given that the development is compliant with the car parking requirements of the R-Codes, the City is unable to require more car parking than that required by the R-Codes.

Property Values

The impact of a development on property values is not a relevant planning consideration.

Disruption to rear fence and garden

Dividing fences are a civil matter, which requires consultation between neighbours prior to any change. The proponent has advised that it would liaise with any neighbours where fences or property would be affected. The development does not require any works on adjacent properties.

Set precedent

The merits of this application, including the plot ratio variation, have been considered. Given the surrounding development and the desired character of the area, it is considered that the development would not set an undesirable precedent. The proposal is consistent with orderly and proper planning.

Create social problems

This two bedroom dwelling development is designed to accommodate the one or two person households or small families that make up over half of all households in Western Australia. There is no guarantee that any form of development in the district, from a single house, grouped dwelling or multiple dwelling will not create social problems.

Extent of notification

The development was referred for comment to the landowners and occupiers of the properties identified in Figure 3. The extent of the notification was deemed appropriate to those nearby properties to the proposed development.

Insufficient kerbside storage and insufficient bins

The proponent has demonstrated that one general waste bin and one recycling bin per dwelling can be stored both on site (in the bin storage areas) and on the verge for collection.

Other Comments

One of the objectors raised concern that as an adjoining landowner he was not notified of the development. A neighbour notification letter was sent to this landowner, however, it was returned to the City from Ray White Real Estate, being the ‘care of’ addressee the City had on its records. The objector/landowner was made aware of this following submission of his objection.
One of the objectors requested a representative of the City visit her site. A City Officer visited the objector’s property (50B Smythe Street) as requested. The view of the subject site from the objector’s property was assessed and the concerns of the objector and the adjacent property (50A Smythe Street) owner were discussed.

Following this meeting, discussions occurred with the proponent to determine a way to try to reduce the bulk of the building, specifically at the rear of the site where it would have the most impact on adjacent properties. The intent of the bulk reduction was to try to provide a transition between the existing smaller scale development and the proposed development of greater density.

As a result the proponent agreed to reduce the finished floor levels (FFL) of the development from RL6.3 to RL5.9. This is a reduction of 0.4m. Whilst the development already complies with building height and overshadowing requirements, this reduction in height will further reduce the building bulk.

Conclusion

The proposed development of 20 Multiple Dwellings complies with TPS2 and is generally consistent with the R-Codes. The plot ratio variation is consistent with the scale of adjacent development and the future desired character of the locality. The proponent’s revised plans reduce the building bulk on adjoining properties.

On balance of the matters raised by submissioners, the development is considered to be suitable for the site. It is recommended that Council approve the application for 20 Multiple Dwellings, subject to conditions that are intended to maintain the amenity of the area.

6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

7. Officer Recommendation

That Council APPROVE the application for 20 Multiple Dwellings on Lots 491 and 492 (Nos. 49 and 51) Lewington Street, Rockingham, subject to the following conditions and advice note:-

Conditions

1. The proponent must submit amended plans that provide a Finished Floor Level (FFL) of RL5.9 for Units 9 and 19 and corresponding courtyard FFLs of RL5.8 for these two units. The building height of the end units (10 and 20) shall be commensurately reduced. The plans must be submitted to, and to the satisfaction of the City, prior to the application for a Building Permit.

2. Earthworks and batters must be stabilised to prevent sand blowing and dust nuisance, for the duration of development.

3. All stormwater must be contained and disposed of on-site at all times, to the satisfaction of the City.

4. A Landscaping Plan must be prepared and include the following detail, to the satisfaction of the City, prior to applying for a Building Permit – Certified.

(i) The location, number and type of existing and proposed trees and shrubs, including calculations for the landscaping area;
(ii) Any lawns to be established;
(iii) Any natural landscape areas to be retained;
(iv) Those areas to be reticulated or irrigated; and
(v) Verge treatments.

5. The proposed paving on the verge adjacent to the kerb shall be removed.

6. The front fencing, bounding the courtyards, shall contain infill panels to be spaced to enable visual permeability above 1.2m. The front façade of the bin storage areas shall also include infill panels to break up the blank façade above 1.2m. These panels shall be consistent with the panels in the courtyard fence.

7. The landscaping must be completed prior to the occupation of the development, and must be maintained at all times to the satisfaction of the City.
8. The street setback area and all verge areas must be landscaped and reticulated, prior to the occupation of the development and must be maintained at all times.

9. The carpark must:-
   (i) be designed in accordance with Australian/New Zealand Standard AS/NZS 2890.1:2004, Parking facilities, Part 1: Off-street car parking unless otherwise specified by this approval, prior to applying for a Building Permit - Certified;
   (ii) be constructed, sealed, kerbed, drained and marked prior to the development being occupied and maintained thereafter;
   (iii) have lighting installed, prior to the occupation of the development; and
   (iv) confine all illumination to the land in accordance with the requirements of Australian Standard AS 4282—1997, Control of the obtrusive effects of outdoor lighting, at all times.

10. The car park must comply with the above requirements for the duration of the development.

11. The development must be connected to Water Corporation sewer mains prior to the occupation of the development, and must remain connected at all times.

12. Arrangements must be made for the amalgamation of the land onto one Certificate of Title prior to applying for a Building Permit - Certified or, alternatively, a Deed of Agreement being entered into between the landowner and the City of Rockingham requiring the amalgamation of all lots onto one Certificate of Title prior to the occupation of the development.

13. Clothes drying facilities (excluding electric clothes dryers) must be designed for each Multiple Dwelling, to be screened from public view, prior to applying for a Building Permit - Certified, and implemented as such for the duration of the development.

14. The facilities, so designed, must be completed prior to occupation of the development and must be retained at all times.

15. Arrangements being made to the satisfaction of the City for the payment of contributions towards the Administration and Community Infrastructure items identified in Amendment No.114 to the City of Rockingham Town Planning Scheme No.2, prior to applying for a Building Permit – Certified.

Footnotes
(i) A Building Permit - Certified must be obtained for all retaining walls prior to construction; the applicant and owner should liaise with the City's Building Services in this regard.
(ii) With respect to Condition 4, the applicant and owner should liaise with the City's Parks Services to confirm requirements for landscaping plans.
(iii) Air conditioning must be located in positions that are preferably ‘on-ground’ or located and designed to minimise noise intrusion to neighbours, in compliance with the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulation 1997.

8. Committee Recommendation

That Council APPROVE the application for 20 Multiple Dwellings on Lots 491 and 492 (Nos. 49 and 51) Lewington Street, Rockingham, subject to the following conditions and advice note:-

Conditions
1. The proponent must submit amended plans that provide a Finished Floor Level (FFL) of RL5.9 for Units 9 and 19 and corresponding courtyard FFLs of RL5.8 for these two units. The building height of the end units (10 and 20) shall be commensurately reduced. The plans must be submitted to, and to the satisfaction of the City, prior to the application for a Building Permit.
2. Earthworks and batters must be stabilised to prevent sand blowing and dust nuisance, for the duration of development.
3. All stormwater must be contained and disposed of on-site at all times, to the satisfaction of the City.
4. A Landscaping Plan must be prepared and include the following detail, to the satisfaction of the City, prior to applying for a Building Permit – Certified.
(i) The location, number and type of existing and proposed trees and shrubs, including calculations for the landscaping area;
(ii) Any lawns to be established;
(iii) Any natural landscape areas to be retained;
(iv) Those areas to be reticulated or irrigated; and
(v) Verge treatments.

5. The proposed paving on the verge adjacent to the kerb shall be removed.

6. The front fencing, bounding the court yards, shall contain infill panels to be spaced to enable visual permeability above 1.2m. The front façade of the bin storage areas shall also include infill panels to break up the blank façade above 1.2m. These panels shall be consistent with the panels in the courtyard fence.

7. The landscaping must be completed prior to the occupation of the development, and must be maintained at all times to the satisfaction of the City.

8. The street setback area and all verge areas must be landscaped and reticulated, prior to the occupation of the development and must be maintained at all times.

9. The carpark must:-
   (i) be designed in accordance with Australian/New Zealand Standard AS/NZS 2890.1:2004, Parking facilities, Part 1: Off-street car parking unless otherwise specified by this approval, prior to applying for a Building Permit - Certified;
   (ii) be constructed, sealed, kerbed, drained and marked prior to the development being occupied and maintained thereafter;
   (iii) have lighting installed, prior to the occupation of the development; and
   (iv) confine all illumination to the land in accordance with the requirements of Australian Standard AS 4282—1997, Control of the obtrusive effects of outdoor lighting, at all times.

10. The car park must comply with the above requirements for the duration of the development.

11. The development must be connected to Water Corporation sewer mains prior to the occupation of the development, and must remain connected at all times.

12. Arrangements must be made for the amalgamation of the land onto one Certificate of Title prior to applying for a Building Permit - Certified or, alternatively, a Deed of Agreement being entered into between the landowner and the City of Rockingham requiring the amalgamation of all lots onto one Certificate of Title prior to the occupation of the development.

13. Clothes drying facilities (excluding electric clothes dryers) must be designed for each Multiple Dwelling, to be screened from public view, prior to applying for a Building Permit - Certified, and implemented as such for the duration of the development.

14. The facilities, so designed, must be completed prior to occupation of the development and must be retained at all times.

15. Arrangements being made to the satisfaction of the City for the payment of contributions towards the Administration and Community Infrastructure items identified in Amendment No.114 to the City of Rockingham Town Planning Scheme No.2, prior to applying for a Building Permit – Certified.

Footnotes
(i) A Building Permit - Certified must be obtained for all retaining walls prior to construction; the applicant and owner should liaise with the City's Building Services in this regard.
(ii) With respect to Condition 4, the applicant and owner should liaise with the City's Parks Services to confirm requirements for landscaping plans.
(iii) Air conditioning must be located in positions that are preferably 'on-ground' or located and designed to minimise noise intrusion to neighbours, in compliance with the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulation 1997.

Committee Voting – 3/1
(Cr Hamblin voted against)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The Committee's Reason for Varying the Officer's Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. **Reports of Councillors**  
Nil

14. **Addendum Agenda**  
Nil

15. **Motions of which Previous Notice has been given**  
Nil

16. **Notices of Motion for Consideration at the Following Meeting**  
Nil

17. **Urgent Business Approved by the Person Presiding or by Decision of the Committee**  
Nil

18. **Matters Behind Closed Doors**  
Nil

19. **Date and Time of Next Meeting**  
The next Planning Services Committee Meeting will be held on **Monday 20 August 2012** in the Council Boardroom, Council Administration Building, Civic Boulevard, Rockingham. The meeting will commence at 4:00pm.

20. **Closure**  
There being no further business, the Chairperson thanked those persons present for attending the Planning Services Committee meeting, and declared the meeting closed at 4.36pm.